Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. V, NO. 39, *Issue Number* 244, SEPTEMBER 29, 1948 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

OCT 5 1948

DESIGN FOR PEACE

by Edna Lonigan

The magnitude of the Berlin debacle is now belatedly disclosed to the American people. It illustrates the price we pay for letting channels for the communication of ideas be filled by State propagandists.

As the whole history of the Berlin bungling shows, in a political sense American citizens can no longer see or hear each other. Lacking adequate information they cannot intelligently discuss or debate, and so they can no longer control policy. Policy-making is monopolized by officials of Big Government.

The genius of this country lies in its citizenry. What good we have accomplished is not due to landed gentry, industrial princes, military general staffs, or governmental planners. It has been done by the wide dispersion of enterprise and skill in getting things done, among the whole body of citizens, and by the self-restraint which is an essential ingredient of real competence.

Our nation guided itself for centuries by the habit of picking up immediate problems and solving them. When we turn to planning by a governmental elite, our policies have neither the virtues of a democratic Republic, nor those of an aristocracy disciplined in foreign affairs like the British, nor those of a trained technical bureaucracy like the Germans. So it is no wonder that our foreign policy under the New Deal has been so futile. Even without the Communist infiltration we would still have failed to deal adequately with the world crisis.

The outstanding example of governmental planning before us today is the "Truman Doctrine" for holding Communism. This threatens militarization of our Society; tremendous strain on our economy to bolster potential Allies while the American standard of living falls; return to rationing, controls and other paraphernalia of the Police State.

The military are not to blame for this surrender to the prevailing intellectual climate of absolutism. The military have their faults, like all of us, but in the struggle for power, they are the merest innocents in competition with civilians who have tasted the joys of being a

Copyright 1948 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governing elite. The military have a code of conduct, a tradition of restraint. Our planners have neither.

Obviously most Americans are agreed that we must now take the lead in stopping Russian aggression. But if we do not want to militarize ourselves for this end, we must have an alternative design for peace which is at least equally practical, immediate and effective.

II

Such a design is ready to our hands. But it will not be adopted unless we first eliminate the thought-control which is exercised by our governmental elite. They want the Police State policy, because that is the way to consolidate their power.

The primary objective of American foreign policy now should be establishment of the United States of Europe.

Europe was fired by Napoleon's dream of uniting all the countries of Europe into a Continental system. They knew the nations should be one unit for the same reason that the founders of our country knew the colonies should become one unit. Even Hitler owned much of his early strength to the widespread European belief that he might succeed where Napoleon had failed.

If Europe were united in one U. S. E. there would be an immediate lifting of the marginal income of the Continent, because of savings from tariff barriers, transportation barriers, political competition, artificially created jealousy, and all the other concomitants of narrow nationalism. Millions of people who are now below the subsistence level would be raised above it.

The advantage to Americans would be a complete shift of the world balance of power. Instead of capitalizing on "American Imperialism", Russia would be confronted on her western border with a real "Third Force" which could dispose of the economic and military resources of fifteen nations. We would help, for the short run. But, as the cement of the federation hardened, we could withdraw.

Ideally, perhaps, the English should be outside, but Winston Churchill, possessing in this respect the brilliant political insight of the British aristocracy, recognizes that England's only chance of leadership lies in bringing political stability to Europe.

That may mean that Great Britain will have one foot in Europe and one in the Empire, or it may mean that we shall in time join with Canada and perhaps even Australia in a larger United States of the West. That is for the future. More immediate is the fact that European federation, instead of weakening the United Nations, provides the only hope for making it work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The model for a United States of Europe is our Constitution. Europe needs a federal government, one in which the participating nations keep a large degree of sovereignty and the new central government does little but set up a uniform standard of money and organize the common defense. The vital force of the new union would be in the release of energy as barriers raised by autarchic governments came down.

The familiar pattern is well outlined in John Fiske's Critical Period of American History. Only one factor really held the colonies together. They had all ceded their colonial possessions in the West to the new union. Whenever proposals were made for breaking up the Confederation, they could not agree on dismembering the Northwest Territory. It was the fact that the central government was trustee of this common property; was guardian of the door to the future, which united Americans until they had learned enough to devise the Constitution.

Europe has a "Northwest", or rather a "Southern Territory", a "common" which can be used for the common good of all, an open land in which the millions of surplus Europeans can find one last empty space.

That "common" is Africa. If the U. S. E. were formed immediately, the nations could cede their under-developed colonies in Africa to the new federal union. They could bring the light of electricity into the Dark Continent, and thereby provide insurance for the millions now destined to die of starvation when the next world economic hurricane blows over the shattered ruins of Europe.

The new "states" in Africa would join the union on equal terms, as Illinois and Ohio joined the thirteen colonies. The districts now self-governing could remain free, or join as their people wished. The technical maturity of Europe would soon lift Eurafrica to economic equality with the other industrial nations.

The hordes of displaced persons in Europe today are more than a war phenomenon. They are also the vanguard of the Malthusian Judgment Day. Western Europe confronts a problem more fundamental than that of Communism. From 1492 to 1900, the little European nations, with their new navigation instruments and their new economic inventions, opened up continent after continent of almost empty space. They also poured forth a phenomenal stream of new lives, billions of them, which filled the empty spaces with people. Now the open continents are closed. But the new lives still come flooding in.

Of course the temptation will be to use Africa to postpone the accounting; to fill up the empty spaces there and leave us with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same problem a generation or two later. But we can hope that the magnificent intellectual ability of Europe will achieve a better solution, once it is freed from the service of petty national politics.

IV

American aid could be far better used in helping to build harbors, roads and airstrips in Africa, as we did during the war, than in bolstering the autarchical governments of Europe under ERP, as our planners are now doing.

One condition is absolute. The program here outlined cannot be implemented by government planners; American or European. It is the nature of their work, of the natural selection in Big Government, that they build Power and nothing but Power. This plan is to free men from dependence on governments.

From the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century, the Western world really tried to turn its attention from Power to Production. That was an achievement of individuals, working in free co-operation. It was their anxiety to escape from government planners which shifted power for a few centuries from officials and soldiers to citizens and producers.

England and America are now faced with a choice between Adam Smith and Frederick the Great; between resources managed by free citizens or an over-reaching government forever extending its controls. Our free Society can survive only if citizens take back their individual responsibility to plan, only if every dollar left in the hands of the citizens is put to work in building a new world of free production and free employment under private direction. If citizens regain their economic power, they can then pull back from the government planners resources they are now using to bring degradation to all.

This essential revolt can succeed only if every citizen, every preacher, every newspaper editor, every teacher, who believes in freedom, will dedicate himself to the task of replanting free investment and free employment in every empty space, so that there will be no millions of hopeless people waiting for some Fuehrer to save them from the utter catastrophe they apprehend.

If the people of the United States undertook to aid in establishing Europe and Africa on a firm foundation of political and economic freedom, we could then safely trust our military leaders to plan the necessary defenses. These would be progressively less necessary as the revival of hope in Europe itself raised barriers against barbarism.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events September 29, 1948

By Frank C. Hanighen

Some official circles deprecate newspaper descriptions of the European situation as "explosive" and "critical". The fact that the Western Powers are placing the Berlin problem before the UN, it is felt, does not necessarily imply any fatal outcome. Russia's hint about withdrawal from UN is taken with a grain of salt; it was probably meant to arouse apprehensions in France and other Western European countries. Russia, it is believed, has no intention of pulling out. Some observers characterize the placing of the Berlin situation before the UN as simply a continuation of the Moscow negotiations under another form. It may be all to the good that diplomacy will be carried on in the open forum of the international organization, and that there will be a wide panel of consulting nations. Such, at least, are the reassuring reactions of quarters which should normally reflect concern at any really dangerous development.

The basic situation in Berlin, however, has not improved. It should be mentioned that there are some official circles here which are talking more openly of possible countermeasures against Soviet Russia. General economic sanctions, cutting off of shipments of certain vital goods to Russia, detention of Russian ships (originally transferred to Russia under lend-lease) in Western ports, closing of narrow seas and the Suez and Panama canals to Russian vessels -- all these moves have been under consideration. It would not be unexpected if some of them, at least, were made by the Big Three.

* * * * *

It is a matter of surprise among Washington observers that the Republicans have overlooked one point in their rebuttal of the President's attacks on the Eightieth Congress. Exposure of the President's tactics in the case of a certain piece of veteran's legislation would prove damaging to his campaign. Under the leadership of Senator John S. Cooper of Kentucky (himself a World War II veteran) the last Congress passed the "War Claims Act of 1948" and the President in fact signed it on July 3. The measure has great humanitarian value.

It provides for the establishment of a Commission to receive claims presented by Americans imprisoned by German and Japanese forces during the war, and by widows and orphans of those who died in prison. The plight of those who survived enemy camps is for the most part deplorable; many were so starved and tortured that they have become permanent invalids. Congress framed the measure so that the financial burden does not rest on the American taxpayer; payment will be made from enemy assets seized by the United States during the war. Some 115,000 former prisoners or dependents are eligible for benefits.

The Commission should today be receiving applications and processing them, for there is a time limit. But President Truman has made no move whatsoever to create such a Commission. The War Claims Act contains sufficient authority for the President to detail clerical and other personnel to prepare necessary forms and to take care of applications. The White House takes the attitude that nothing can be done about setting up the Commission or carrying on its work because Congress did not make a special appropriation. The Congress, according to the White House, has therefore indicated its intention that the Commission shall not function.

The argument is specious and can only be interpreted as another Presidential attempt to discredit Congress. In the first place, enemy funds can provide money. In the second place, there are about two million employees of the Federal Govern-

Copyright 1948 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, and perhaps only a half dozen clerks would be necessary to start the work (applications must be filed by July 3, 1950). The executive branch of the Government has rarely before been hesitant about transferring clerks to any project it wished to expedite. Delay in filing applications will delay paying of benefits. The President's policy may indeed be characterized as a very cruel by-product of his crusade against the legislative branch of the Government.

* * * * *

There are good reasons for increasing talk about Congressman Carl Hinshaw as a possible Secretary of Defense under Dewey. Old "Capitol Hill" hands say that Hinshaw is probably the best informed Member of Congress on problems of defense and at the same time is thoroughly independent of the warring branches of the services in the Pentagon. They liken Hinshaw to former Congressman Ross Collins, who in the Thirties was known as the "Father of the Tank in the Army", the "Sponsor of the Flying Fortress", etc., and generally exerted a progressive influence on defense legislation. It is noted that the opinions in favor of air power in Dewey's statement on Air Force Day are substantially those of Hinshaw. Finally, the fact that Hinshaw is a Californian will prove no handicap when Dewey seeks to arrange his Cabinet appointments with an eye to geography.

* * * * *

In the past week, ECA has taken a step which establishes a dangerous precedent. In the opinion of those who have studied the European Recovery Program, a measure which was sold to Congress on the basis of "development for recovery" has become in fact a "relief program". The step was the release of what are termed "counterpart" funds. Because of the complexity of the matter, few newspapers and commentators have even mentioned it, much less contemplated its implications. Congressmen like Taber of New York, who preserved a critical and conservative attitude towards ECA, are now in a position to say that ECA has thrown off the mask; that ECA is now a dispenser of political relief funds instead of being the careful provider of money for European development.

When ECA gives supplies to European countries, the recipient government sells them to its own or other people. It was provided in the ERP Act that, for every dollar of these supplies, the recipient government would place an equivalent amount of its own currency in what is called a "counterpart fund". The law provides that this fund may be "held or used" for internal monetary stabilization or for the development of new wealth. The New York Times from Paris reports that "the original idea was that the most effective use of it would be to hold it out of circulation for deflationary purposes". Now, inflation is rising dangerously again in France and needs to be checked.

As for the alternative objective -- the development of new wealth -- ECA has so far not disclosed just what the projects in France will be. However, newspaper reports and an objective appraisal of the French situation suggest that the decision was made, not on the basis of creating new wealth, but because the Queuille Government faces grave difficulties. Last week, it was confronted with the demand that it raise French wages from 10 to 15 per cent. Few political observers in the Capital, who have watched the proceedings, doubt that the release of counterpart funds was to save Queuille. "What has been done", comments the Wall Street Journal, "is to make available to the French Government a sum of money to meet a current political crisis". The end is not yet. ECA has also released counterpart funds for the occupied territory of Trieste; and the New York Times reports that similar action is to be taken in Italy. Certainly, ECA has entered a new phase. It may have been originally contemplated by the elements which pushed the ERP Act, but it was not presented to Congress as the "relief measure" which it is fast becoming.

* * * * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We caught Congressman Taber for a few minutes during his brief visit to the Capital last week. "I am hoping", he said, "while I am here to do something to halt the ridiculous dismantling of German industrial plants. Unless the German people are put to work, they will continue to be supported off the charity of the United States. Unless the German people are allowed to produce transformers and engines and steel products other than military, European recovery and self-support will be delayed indefinitely. The dismantling of these German plants will probably be followed up by taking new machinery and equipment out of the United States." The Congressman told us that he had just made substantially these remarks to newspapermen. But search of the ticker tape of four news agencies that day revealed that not one word of this interview was carried.

* * * * *

Two weeks ago, we reported that the New England Council was meeting at Dixville Notch to explore ways and means for planning a steel industry in that area, to meet the new situation resulting from the Supreme Court decision on the basing-point. We learn now, from persons present at the meeting, that a decision was made to proceed with the plan. This outcome should indeed clear the air for New England industry. Following the Supreme Court decision, there was wide abandonment of the basing-point system throughout the country, with varying repercussions. The effect on New England was to pose the following dilemma: either New England hard-goods industries would have to move near to steel centers such as Pittsburgh; or New England would have to provide the steel for those plants adversely affected.

Big steel companies, it is understood, opposed the decision at the Dixville Notch meeting. Now that the New England Council has apparently resolved to proceed with the regional steel plan, however, it is expected that some steel firms will drop their resistance and seek to participate in the plan. It is believed that they will offer to provide the "know-how" as their share in the creation of a New England steel company. Actual unfolding of the plan is awaited with interest.

* * * * *

The truth about the Ilse Koch affair reportedly remains concealed behind some surprising considerations which are ignored in the many very natural protests on the subject. Frau Ilse Koch was convicted of inhuman practices, carried on when she was in charge of the notorious Buchenwald concentration camp, and was sentenced to life imprisonment. Last week, the U. S. authorities in Germany so reduced Frau Koch's sentence that she will be released in October, 1949. The authorities said that the original sentence was "excessive" because there was no "convincing evidence" that she selected inmates for extermination to obtain their skins for lampshades. Lesser charges, however, were confirmed.

The fact is that reduction of the Koch sentence is but one of a group of similar commutations of sentences of various Germans. We learn from reliable sources that these official acts were not inspired by any decision to correct justice, or to bestow lenience on criminals. On the contrary, it is said, the decision is actually an attempt by American authorities to head off a first-class scandal involving the American Prosecution staff which brought these and other Germans before Allied tribunals. Germans, with the assistance of American legal counsel, have unearthed a mass of surprising evidence. Dozens of affidavits have been secured showing that the American Prosecution in Germany obtained evidence by third-degree, intimidation, pressure, torture and beatings. Without this kind of tainted evidence, it is claimed, the American Prosecution staff would have been unable successfully to press many cases against Nazis and other Germans. These affidavits, plus much material concerning the unfairness of Prosecution methods, had been accumulating for some time and were about to break into print. Hence, the commutations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Social Contract: Essays by Locke, Hume and Rousseau: Introduction by Sir Ernest Barker. New York and London: The Oxford University Press. $1.75. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

The idea of the social contract -- that is, of a voluntary agreement among the members of a Society, defining in more or less precise terms the relationships that shall exist between the government and the citizens -- underlies the whole structure of American political institutions, so that there are many who think the two must stand or perish together. The essence of the doctrine is that political constitutions are not organic growths, but spring almost full blown from the necessities and desires of men in a particular set of circumstances and at a particular period of time. In a word, systems of government are not evolved, but are, as the Declaration of Independence has it, "instituted among men" for express purposes recognized by all concerned. This doctrine is set forth as a "self-evident truth", and as such was accepted by a great many Eighteenth Century minds. Nevertheless, the idea was itself of long growth, traceable to many sources, before it was crystallized in the form most familiar to us in Locke's Second Treatise on Civil Government. From the Scriptures came both the tradition of a primordial state of mankind and the notion of a law instituted by covenant; from the Roman and medieval jurisconsults came the concept that the powers of government are delegated to it by the governed; from the Stoic philosophers came the notion of a universal human nature and of an oecumenical natural law; from a long succession of scholastic theologians, most notably St. Thomas, Francisco de Vitoria and the Jesuits, Mariana and Suarez, came the intellectual custom of appealing the arbitrary edicts of princes to a transcendent law, common to all men, applicable to all times and places and discernible by the unaided light of human reason.

It is precisely this question of natural law which distinguishes the theory of the social contract as formulated by Locke, and as formulated by Thomas Hobbes, and it explains why in the one case it could be employed as a reason for restricting the powers of government, and in the other as a justification of monarchial absolutism. The author of Leviathan rejects the doctrine of natural law; for him the state of nature is one of anarchy and incessant strife -- "of such a warre as is of every man against every man", and "the notions of Right and Wrong, Justice and Injustice, have there no place". For Locke, however, the state of nature "has a law to govern it which obliges everyone; and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions". It is plain that underlying the respective applications of the theory, we have two radically different conceptions of the nature of Man, affording yet another testimony that every system of human rights must in the last analysis depend upon the definition of Man as a rational creature.

From the point of view of our own time the irremediable weakness of the theory of a primordial contract is the absence of historical or anthropological evidence to support it. All that we know of savage Societies tends to discredit it, and to support the belief that the notions of contract and of individual liberty belong to the civilized rather than to the primitive imagination. History was the point on which the doctrine was attacked by David Hume in the era of its greatest influence. He elaborated the observations set down by Pascal in one of the Pensees, that the true foundation of government is generally usurpation and violence, and that obedience to it is obtained in the first instance by fear; but in the course of time, understanding is reached which, although not constituting an implicit contract, has nevertheless the effect of one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED